going to be.

1

2

3

4

5

6

.7

8

9

10

1.1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

They can be used for the local agencies own knowledge but it has nothing to do with the tier level. So regardless of the fact -- let's say for example that Mr. Titus' is relieved of his duty to register at some point in time. If Washington State ratifies the Adam Walsh Act, and this says right in the guidelines he would then have to register again and would be subject to lifetime registration as a Tier 3 offender.

Q Okay, does it change the community notification at all in terms of what information would be involved in the type prepared?

MR. LYON: Objection as to relevance.

JUDGE SIPPEL: I will overrule the objection. This is light, you just want to touch on it. Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: It would include employment information which is not now

NEAL R. GROSS

1	included. It would include vehicle
2	information which is not now included. It
3	would include license information which is not
4	now included. Which means it would also
5	include motor vehicle licenses, an actual
6	digital copy of their drivers license. It
7	would include FCC licenses.
8	It would include anything that has
9	a moniker where they are known by.
10	BY MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT:
11	Q Would it include email addresses?
12	A It would include email addresses.
13	Yes, it would.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: So it sounds to me
15	like this new proposal, this new legislation
16	rather in one sense, well in many senses seems
17	to be that the common word for that would be
18	draconian. I mean this is really bringing the
19	hammer down.
20	THE WITNESS: It is bringing the
21	hammer down. Unfortunately Your Honor, we're
2.2	going from a system where we are not looking

at the science anymore. We are now taking all 1 sex offenders and lumping them into one barrel 2 and saying -- actually three barrels and 3 saying you're either this based on your crime 4 or conviction. G And anything that you may have done 6 in treatments positively, anything you may have done in your life to get yourself back on 8 the straight and narrow doesn't make any 9 difference. You fall under this category, 10 11 boom that's it, you're done. It seems a little draconian to me. 12 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well I am not going 13 to comment on it myself. But it certainly 1.4 sounds like it's headed to the Supreme Court 15 because it's adopted. 16 Has there been anything filed yet. 17 The law is effective. It's just that the 18 states have until 2009 to comply. Is that --19 20 or is it --THE WITNESS: Half of the states 2.1

have already complied. And Ohio being one of

22

1	them. There's already challenges that are
2.	making their way through the system.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Sure, but it is
4	voluntary on a state by state basis?
5	THE WITNESS: Yes, but if a state
6	chooses not to then
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: You pointed that
8	out.
9	THE WITNESS: - they lose their
10	ten percent of their
1	JUDGE SIPPEL: They lose Federal
12	money.
13	THE WITNESS: Federal money,
L4	yes.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Can we move on now.
16	BY MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT:
17	Q Would it have any different effect
18	on the access to minors by sex offenders?
1.9	MR. LYON: Continued objection.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: -Yes, I'm going to
2.1.	sustain that one.
22	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Okay.

1	BY MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT:
2	Q Well, I have a couple of questions
3	regarding getting your help reading the
4	documents that you produced to us.
5	What is referred to the
6	documents refer to a manifest injustice.
7	Could you explain what a manifest injustice
8	is?
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Where is that.
10	Where do you find a reference to that?
11	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: It says it
12	several times in terms of his sentencing.
13	Manifest injustice of 65 weeks.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Which exhibit are
15	you going through now?
16	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Exhibit 4.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
18	MR. LYON: If I can help I think
19	it's in at least one of his juvenile
20	adjudications. Given the length of time it's
21	taking to find this can we at least
22	THE WITNESS: It's on page 14.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you. Now
2	what's your question?
3	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: I just wanted
4	him to define the term manifest injustice.
5	It's a sentencing term used in
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Where do you see it.
7	f'm on 14.
8	THE WITNESS: Okay, it's down where
9	it says 12/15/89 and then the paragraph right
10	underneath that. Sentence to a manifest
11	injustice of 65 weeks.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm missing it.
13	MR. L7ON: Next to the last
1.4	paragraph on page 14, Your Honor.
1.5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Page 14.
16	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Second
1.7	paragraph from the bottom, second line from
18	the bottom of the paragraph.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh I see, I got you.
20	Titus was sentenced to a manifest injustice of
21	65 weeks. That's a term of art?
22	MR. KNOWLES KELLETT: Yes, and it's

1	used a number of times, Your Honor. And I
2	just was unable to locate it. And it's just -
3	- when we go to do findings it
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right.
5	BY MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT:
6	Q Could you describe what a manifest
7	injustice is?
8	A in the Juvenile Court system
9	manifest injustice has the same meaning as
10	exceptional sentence in the adult system.
11	Q Okay, what is exceptional sentence
12	in the adult system?
13	A Means that the Judge has gone
7 4	beyond the standard range of sentencing.
15	Q Okay, and why would they do
16	something like that generally. I'm not asking
17	in this particular what sort of
18	circumstances would
19	A lf a crime was particularly
20	egregious or there was excessive violence,
21	multiple convictions a Judge can choose to
22	give an exceptional sentence, or in this case

1	a manifest injustice.
2	Q Okay, and now the really simple
3	one. They refer repeatedly to the Tri-Cities
4	area. Are you familiar with the term Tri-
5	Cities area?
6	A I am.
7	Q. Okay, could you describe for us
8	what the Tri-Cities area is?
9	A 'That's Richland, Pasco, and
1.0	Kennewick.
11	Q Okay, where -
12	A Those cities their in the
13	southern, south central part of Washington
14	State.
15	Q Okay.
16	A And those three cities are in close
17	proximity to each other. Kind of like they
18	call the Twin Cities in Minneapolis, St. Paul.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's south of
20	Seattle then. Is that right?
21	THE WITNESS: It's southeast.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Southeast of

1	Seattle.
2	THE WITNESS: Seattle would be on
3	the west coast.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Right.
5	THE WITNESS: And this is the
6	Tri-Cities are in the south central part of
7	Washington State.
8	MR. TITUS: Almost the southeast
9	corner.
1.0	JUDGE SIPPEL: Almost the southeast
11	corner did you say?
12	MR. TITUS: That's correct.
1.3	BY MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT:
14	Q Okay, in doing Mr. Titus' most
15	recent risk assessment what factors did you
16	consider to be important?
17	A The 🤲
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well can we get the
19	date of when it was done first?
20	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Okay.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: I want to start with
22	dates on these things.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1.	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Okay.
2	BY MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT:
3	Q I believe you did you double
4	checked it after this whole FCC matter. Is
5	that your testimony?
б	MR. LYON: Objection, as to form.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Sustained.
8	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: All right,
9	this is just introductory.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: I know, but your
11	question started out was with respect to doing
12	such an assessment. My question was what date
1.3	was it done?
1.4	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Okay.
i 5	JUDGE SIPPEL: And then you go from
16	there. What date was the second assessment or
1.7	the most current one?
18	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: I'm actually
19	talking about the most current one.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: The most current.
21	What date was that?
2.2	THE WITNESS: I'd have to look it

4	up.
2	BY MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT:
3	Q Okay, how many assessements have
4	you done and when were they done?
5	A Well I have done three assessments.
6	One was the one done by the committee in 1994.
7	Q Right.
8	A One was done right after the
9	incident in Mercer Island and I don't recall
10	that date exactly.
.1	JUDGE SIPPEL: 2004 is Mercer
12	Island?
L 3	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Yes.
14	THE WITNESS: And then I did one
15	using the current scoring tool that the State
1.6	of Washington mandates and that was done just
17	prior to meeting with you back in was it
18	March or April?
19	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: In February
20	I visited your office and
2.1	THE WITNESS: February.
22	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: I believe

1	you did it shortly thereafter, after I asked
2	you to pull the file.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Can we have a year
4	plcase?
5	MS. LANCASTER: 2008.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you.
7	MR. LYON: Would counsel accept a
8	stipulation that it was done on February 26,
9	,083
10	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Yes.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: And the other one
12	was done in 2004 in connection with the
13	Meridian Island
14	THE WITNESS: Mercer Island.
15	MS. LANCASTER: Mercer Island.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, all right.
1.7	All right, which one do you want to go to
18	next?
19	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: I want to go
20	to the most recent one.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
22	BY MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT:
1	

1.	Q Can you explain how you did that
2.	risk assessment, the most recent one?
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: I still want to know
4	why it was done. I'm still not clear why it
5	was done. This was done on an actuarial
6	basis, right?
7	THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: And why was it done?
9	THE WITNESS: Just to make sure
10	that based on that actuarial model, if we had
11	done it in 1997, that he would have scored out.
12	as a Level 3 which is what we had made him.
13	Or would he have been a Level 2.
1.4	Using this model he would have been Level 2
15	then I'd have had some problems explaining
16	that you know as to my justification for
1.7	making him a 3.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well he was made a
19	3 when was he made a 3?
20	THE WITNESS: 2004.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, so after
22	Mercer Island he was made a 3?

1	THE WITNESS: Right.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: And was that 3 based
3	on the subjective system?
4	THE WITNESS: That was yes, that
5	was based on his activities in Mercer Island.
6	It was based on an automobile accident that he
7	had in Seattle in which him and the driver got
8	into a verbal altercation.
9	. When she asked him if he was a
10	police officer and he wouldn't tell her
11	because he was acting like one. All those
12	things told us that he was a higher risk than
13	what we initially had him.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right.
15	THE WITNESS: So using the
16	actuarial model in 2008 I rescored him using
17	all of the information that we had and he came
18	out well into the Level 3 category.
19	JUDGE STPPEL: But there was really
20	no incident that triggered the 2008 actuarial
21	assessment. It was just to kind of bring his
22	situation up to the state of the art so to

speak. I'm paraphrasing myself, so.

1.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

0

1.0

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

THE WITNESS: Well honestly, Your Honor the -- what caused me to do it was the fact that you know knowing that we were going to be doing a hearing, a Court hearing at some point in time and, you know explaining how we risk assessment and with а came иp anticipating someone saying, you mean to tell me that you have a risk assessment on this person but you've never even actuarial.

You know, so just to make sure that we were being fair we did the actuarial risk assessment using all of the information that we have on him to see if we had done this in 1997 when this scoring first came into being where would be have been. And so we did that, I did that.

JUDGE SIPPEL: But this was done.

But the 2008 assessment was done for purposes of this litigation, of this hearing, not for purposes of something else like the Mercer

	1
1.	Island incident?
2	THE WITNESS: That's correct, Your
3	Honor.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
5	BY MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT:
6	Q Is it common when you pull a file
7	to double check your risk assessment?
8	A If there is - if we have a reason
9	to pull a file because of some sort of
10	activity. Maybe it's a patrol officer sending
11	us a field interrogation report on some sex
12	offender they found in a park. We'll pull a
13	file and if there's somebody that they have
14	not have the actuarial model done on yet we
15	will go back and do that.
16	Q Now in '04 you didn't actually do
17	the actual use the actuarial model?
18	A Did not.
19	Q Okay, did you use the experience
20	you had with the actuarial model though to do
21	the risk assessment?
22	A Well that's it. I sat on the end

1	of sentence review board. So I knew based on
2.	, you know all of the information that we had
3	on Mr. Titus that he was going to score a
4	Level 3.
5	Q And at that time you raised him to
6	a Level 3?
•7	A That's correct.
8	O Okay.
9	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: It's your
1.0	witness.
11	CROSS-EXAMINATION
12	BY MR. LYON:
1.3	Q Thank you Detective Shilling for
1.4	coming across the country to be here. Is it
15	fair to say that public has been largely
16	misinformed about the recidivism rate of sex
17	offenders?
18	A Yes.
19	Q And the threat that strangers pose
20	to children?
21	A Yes.
2.2	Q The public largely overestimates
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

-1	the rate of sex offender recidivism don't
1	(he rate or sex offender rectarvism don't
2	they?
3	A They do.
4	Q And the public largely
5	overestimates the threat that strangers pose
6	to children?
7	A That's correct.
8	Q You're familiar with the study done
9	by Harris and Hanson in 2004?
. 0	Λ I am.
1	Q And Dr. Hanson particularly is one
2	of the top researchers in the field of sex
.3	offended research, correct?
4	A He is.
5 ـ	Q And Harris and Hanson study
6	involved more than 4,700 subjects?
7	A I believe so, yes.
. 8	Q And this sample is large enough in
9	your view to be statistically significant?
20	A. Yes.
?1	Q And the Harris and Hanson study
?2	involved a 15 year follow-up period?
- 1	

1	A Yes it does.
2	Q And from this sample of more than
3	4,700 subjects studied over 15 years Drs.
4	Harris and Hanson found that 73 percent of
5	sexual offenders had not been charged with or
6	convicted of another sexual offense.
7	A That's correct.
8	Q Now in Washington State the
9	recidivism rate is even lower than that isn't
10	it?
1.1	A ft. is.
12	Q It's much lower isn't it?
13	A I'm not sure how much lower. But
14	it is lower.
15	Q Well the Washington State Institute
16	for Public Policy. I believe you mentioned
17	that organization earlier?
18	A Yes I did.
19	Q Is that an agency in Washington
20	State area?
21	A It is a agency it is a
22	governmental agency that is specifically put

together to assist the legislature in topics
of interest. They act on legislative
requests.
Q Okay, the Washington State
Institute for Public Policy studied recidivism
in Washington didn't they find that only a 3.9
percent recidivism rate over a five year study
period?
A I'd have to take a look and see
which study it is you're talking about and
what the particulars were.
Q Does that sound right to you?
A The 3.5
Q 3.9.
A The 3.9 sounds like it was the
study that they did that took a look at sex
offenders who had completed the sex offender
treatment program at Twin Rivers Correctional
Center and had gone out in I'm sorry, Your
Honor.
JUDGE SIPPEL: That's all right.
THE WITNESS: I kept telling myself

1	this morning remember to turn your phone off.
2	Obviously I forgot.
3	BY MR. LYON:
1	Q You were answering what you thought
5	the 3.9 percent was.
6	A Yes, I believe that was persons who
7	had completed the sex offender treatment
8	program at Twin Rivers Correctional Center.
9	They've done a number of studies
10	and that's why I'm just not sure what study it
1.1.	is you're referring to.
12	Q The first review of Mr. Titus that
13	found him a Level 2, you mentioned that you
14	were on the end of sentence review committee.
15	Who else was on that committee?
16	A Okay, I didn't get two different
17	things.
18	Q Okay, correct me please.
19	A The very first committee that made
20	him a Level 2 was made up of Seattle Police
21	Department personnel.
22	Q Okay.

1.	A There was an Assistant Chief,
2	myself, the head of our Records Bureau, one of
3	the Administrative Staff out of the Chief of
4	Police office, there was a Captain in Charge
5	of the Sexual Assault and Child Abuse Unit,
6	and the Seattle Police Department Legal
7	Advisor.
8	Q Okay, there were not any
9	psychologists?
10	A There were not.
1.1	O No psychiatrists?
12	A No.
13	Q No sex offender researchers?
14	A No.
1.5	Q Is there a written record of the
1.6	material that the committee that made the
17	first determination reviewed? .
L8	A This information that I gave to
19	counsel that I think it's 4.
20	Q Okay, is there any notes of the
21	deliberations of the committee in existence?
22	A No, other than the final
-	

1	determination of Mr. Titus and all the other
2	offenders that were reviewed that day and what
3	their risk scores were.
4	Q Are any notes or minutes made of
5	this committee meeting?
6	(No response.)
7	Q Let me rephrase that. Were there
8	any notes or minutes made of the deliberations
9	of the committee that day?
10	A No.
11	Q Any reason why not?
1.2	A I mean we just didn't take notes of
13	stuff. We had all the file materials there
14	that we reviewed and then we just made a final
1.5	determination on the sheet that you have a
16	copy of.
1.7	Q Do you is there like a show of
1.8	hands for 1, and 2, and 3. Or how
19	A That's exactly how it went.
20	Q So do you start with 3 and go to 1
21	or do you start with 1 and go to 3?

1	of the information how many people think that
2.	he should be a Level 1. We saw a show of
3	hands. How many think he should be a Level 2.
4	In most cases, you know these were
5	pretty clear cut cases. Most people agreed if
6	somebody was 1, 2, or 3 and it wasn't like you
7	had a lot of division there.
8	Q And that was the case with Mr.
9	Titus?
.0	A As far as I recall.
. 1	Q Okay, now help me out then with
12	this end of sentence review board. When was
3	that created?
4	A 1997.
.5	Q Okay, and you were one of the
. 6	original members of it?
7	A Yes.
.8	Q And the - did the end of sentence
.9	review board well tell me what the purpose
20	of that strike that.
21	Who else was on the end of sentence
22	review board in 1997?
,	1

1	A Victoria Roberts who was the Chair.
2.	She is with Department of Corrections. She
3	was the head of the Community Protection Unit.
4	There was a woman from Kris Coleman
5	who was a psychologist with the Department of
6	Social and Health Services. She the
7	Department of Social and Health Services
8	Division of Developmental Disabilities.
9	There was another woman, I can't
10	remember her name right now. She was with
11	DSHS in the Victim Notification Unit.
12	There was a psychologist from
13	Western State Hospital. There was another law
1-1	enforcement officer representing the counties.
15	represented the cities. City law
16	enforcement and he represented county law
17	enforcement.
1.8	There was somebody from Child
19	Protection Services, CPS. There was I'm
20	trying to remember what it was then and not
21	what it is now.
22	Q Anyone else you can think of?